

Rochester Institute of Technology

RIT Scholar Works

Theses

5-1-1984

The evaluation of models to characterize exposure variation due to stress birefringence in pellicles

Charles Mondello

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.rit.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Mondello, Charles, "The evaluation of models to characterize exposure variation due to stress birefringence in pellicles" (1984). Thesis. Rochester Institute of Technology. Accessed from

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by RIT Scholar Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses by an authorized administrator of RIT Scholar Works. For more information, please contact ritscholarworks@rit.edu.

APPROVED 10/03/2013

**ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ACADEMIC SENATE
SEPTEMBER 19, 2013: 12:00-1:50 p.m.
CIMS – SLAUGHTER HALL/2230/2240**

Present: J. Beck; S. Boedo; H. Boice-Pardee; S. Bower; J. Chiavaroli; D. Defibaugh; W. Destler, M. Eastman (CAST Alt.); T. Engström; M. Fluet (GCCIS Alt.); H. Ghazle; S. Gold; J. Haefner; J. Hertzson; G. Hintz; S. Hoi; M. Kotlarchyk; R. Kushalnagar; M. Laver; E. Lawley, J. Lodge; S. Maggelakis; S. Radziszowski; S.M. Ramkumar; R. Raffaele; A. Ray; M. Richmond; V. Serravallo; H. Shahmohamad; R. Stevens; C. Thoms; L. Villasmil Urdaneta; J. Voelkel; F. Walker; H. Yamashita

Members Absent: N. Cifranic; B. Hartpence; J. Lisuzzo; K. McDonald; C. Sheffield; B. Trager; L Wild

Excused: K. Mousley

Presenters and Guests: Margaret Bailey, Enid Cardinal, John Moore, Jeff Pelz, Kristen Waterstram-Rich

Interpreters: Cheryl Bovard, Nicole Crouse-Dickerson

Tech Crew: Maseo Browning, Alex Graff, Jeff Henstenburg

CALL TO ORDER: 12:10 p.m.

COMMUNICATION OFFICER'S REPORT: Minutes of September 5, 2013 were approved.
<http://hdl.handle.net/1850/16835>

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (Michael Laver, AS Chair)

The EC provided time for President Destler to report on the 21-Day Enrollment Report. A memo regarding this had been sent already to the RIT Community. The President reported the following:

- Each year a budget is planned per enrollment predictions and there is a contingency fund to cover shortfalls.
- The contingency fund this year is \$11M.
- The number is down a couple of hundred students this year of returning students. As seen elsewhere, students rush to complete their schooling before the change is made to semesters and 125 additional students graduated in the spring of 2013.
- Additionally, due to other students being on co-op, this reduced the incoming enrollment numbers to 200 fewer students coming to RIT.
- Freshmen retention is down from the previous year.
- This is not a threat, but we should be prudent in our spending and have already identified several million in savings.
- The VP's will have to approve hires.
- A good sign is that the freshman class is the largest ever, which shows we are very healthy.

Discussion and Q&A ensued:

- M. Fluet: When will we know if hires can be made?
President: The Deans and the Provost will discuss this and work as quickly as possible to figure this out. We do plan to make some hires this year.
- J. Chiavaroli: Will waiving tuition fee on less than 20 credits have a significant impact?
President: None.

- J. Voelkel: Should we not have raised more money last year as students rushed to complete their time at RIT earlier?
President: Students had three years to plan this. The graduate students pay by credit hour and some graduate students chose to take fewer courses this year. We have not done this before so it was so hard to predict what would happen this year.
- Q: How does this affect faculty travel to conferences?
President: This is an issue for the Deans and the Provost. There is no plan to eliminate all travel money for departments. Next year we will start from a lower baseline in terms of planning.

Any additional questions can be sent to the President or Provost.

OLD BUSINESS

RABC and SAC Proposed Charges [Discussion and Vote]

<http://hdl.handle.net/1850/16836>

RABC charges were discussed.

- Item number three of the RABC charges (*Work with President Destler as he undertakes the task of developing a 10-year financial plan*) was suggested by President Destler. He said in the future, tuition increases above inflation will be difficult to implement and we will need to make some interesting choices so this is why he suggested this charge for the RABC.
- L. Lawley requested that item 5 be explained which reads: *Explore the financial and resource implications of various instructional delivery models*. She said tenure track faculty do not have to pay certain fees and asked about extending waivers to non-tenure-track faculty?
S. Manian Ramkumar: Faculty are required to work at Imagine RIT or similar events; the question is how to avoid coercion and be compensated for this work.. This may or may not fall into the “service” portion of their plan of work.
S. Maggelakis: She asked about Open House and can this be part of service?
M. Laver: Item 5 can be clarified by the committee. He will consult with those who brought this charge forward.
- A comment was made regarding an adjunct who traveled on Study Abroad who was not given a salary. This was brought up through AAUP.
- H. Shahmohamad: What is Item 2 which reads: *Complete the cost review of administration growth and report findings to the Senate*. Do we think the administration has grown too large?
M. Laver: This charge is a carry-over from last year.
- S. Gold: Is Item 1 addressing benchmarking of faculty? (*Review and make recommendations for promotion-based salary for all faculty ranks.*)
M. Laver: This charge was brought to the committee with the question: Will rewards for tenure/promotion change with inflation? Item 1 is a general statement.

Vote on the motion to approve the charges for the Resource Allocation and Budget Committee carried with one abstention.

Student Affairs Committee (SAC) charges were discussed.

- M. Laver referred to Item 3 of the RABC charges and asked Kathleen Martin to explain this more thoroughly (*Provide input, advice and counsel to the university policy office (Susan Provenzano and Kathleen Martin) on the development of a centralized repository of university-level policies that apply to students.*)
Kathleen Martin: We brought this forward to SAC and this is re-organization of the policies, not changes in content. We want to put student-relevant documents into one central place.

- H. Boice-Pardee: This committee is made up of faculty and students who discuss student affairs, and is not led nor charged by Student Affairs.
- M. Fluet: What is “flipped classroom” and is there one model, or many?
M. Laver: There are many possibilities.
- T. Engström: Pertaining to Item 2 (*Work with RIT Housing Operations, the Center for Residence Life, and the Center for Women and Gender to explore the logistics and operationalization of a PRIDE floor or an area for interested GLBT and “allied” students*) we should decide if this is a good idea before discussing the logistics and could we add the word “principle”? Additionally, isn’t there a committee that already deals with logistics and operations at RIT?
M. Laver: This charge is a carry-over from last year’s decision to go in this direction and was included in the SAC report which was presented to senate last year.
- H. Yamashita: Pertaining to Item 1 (*Solicit and report on student feedback and perspective regarding the proposed “flipped classroom” model.*) who will see this feedback and should this be added to this charge?
M. Laver: The Academic Senate will see this feedback as well as others; we control only the senate portion.
- H. Ghazle: NTID is exploring the idea of the flipped model as it is creating two classrooms that will have the flipped format. As RIT continues to investigate this format, SAC should continue to review it.
- M. Kotlarchyk: In regards to Item 1 of the charges, the question was raised, “why is only the flipped classroom model getting student feedback to be reviewed and why not have a survey on all alternative models of instruction?”
M. Laver: We received a charge to explore the “flipped” classroom model, yet we could be more inclusive in this charge.
- L. Villasmil Urdaneta: In regards to Item 1, will only faculty practicing the “flipped classroom model” investigate this?
- S. Boedo: If the definition is expanded for Item 1 of the charges, it may take too long getting feedback, so he suggested doing just the “flipped” model this year and other models later.
- M. Kotlarchyk: Is Item 1 appropriate for the Student Affairs Committee?
M. Laver: This committee has few charges so this will be fine.

Motion to change the wording of “flipped” classroom model to “alternative teaching delivery models” passed with 13 in favor, 11 opposed and 2 abstentions.

Motion to approve the Student Affairs Committee charges as amended passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Proposed RIT Energy Policy and Presentation (PPt)

<http://hdl.handle.net/1850/16837>

John Moore, Assistant VP for FMS gave a PPt presentation introducing the proposed Energy Policy to the senate today and is looking for feedback. There is a need for an administrative policy to help manage the ever-growing infrastructure at RIT. Enid Cardinal, Senior Sustainability Advisor was also present at the meeting. [See link above of the full proposed policy and the PPt presented at the meeting today.]

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- M. Richmond: Please clarify the policy on weekends, overnight, and intersession.
J. Moore: We will do so.
- V. Serravallo: Will there be a fee to get authorized heat/cooling equipment?
J. Moore: We currently offer an exchange program at no cost if faculty provide data that the temperature is outside the range it should be and FMS can investigate this. If FMS agrees, FMS will provide what is needed.
- Q: Have you considered thermal inertia? Turning off computers can cause problems due to condensation.
J. Moore: We work with ITS to get information on computer practices and yes, we have taken thermal inertia into account.
- J. Goldowitz: He suggested President Destler promulgate the eventual policy. How much cost savings is expected with this policy? Will the savings be used to move RIT to sustainability.
J. Moore: We could save \$.5M per year which equals 2000 metric tons of carbon. And where the money would go, I do not have the authority to tell you where that would go.
- J. Voelkel:
What was the temperature set point this past summer?
J. Moore: It was 75 F as a general rule but it often varies. The new set point of 78 F and humidity levels should be acceptable. There are national standards, and other universities may have varying levels but it is important that the Academic Senate provide feedback regarding classroom temperatures.
- H. Ghazle: This new model is financially and medically sound. Please help us to provide information to our colleagues and how can we persuade our colleagues that this is a good idea?
J. Moore: Enid Cardinal can provide data of interest to you.
- H. Shahmohamad: What about the older buildings which have no control over the temperature in the buildings?
J. Moore: This is a major challenge. Older buildings are an exception to our written policy and we are trying to find solutions.
- Ram: Please change the format of your policy to match the existing Institute Policies.
J. Moore: Yes, we will with Parker.

M. Laver asked that senators send any feedback to John Moore (put email here).

E5.0 Tenure Policy

PPt Presentation, Proposed Policy E5.0 and Current Policy - <http://hdl.handle.net/1850/16837>

Michael Laver suggested that senators write down their comments and suggestions during the presentation of the proposed Policy E5.0. When the presentation is finished, he said the only questions that should come forth are those pertaining to clarification. In a month this proposed policy will return to the senate for discussion.

Margaret Bailey and Jeff Pelz of the Faculty Affairs Committee presented the following per proposed E5.0 Policy.

- a. Flowchart of the submission of the candidate's materials for promotion/tenure – new idea added that the department head sends a request for the letters that went to the external reviewers. The department head will read those letters when they arrive. This is not reflected in the paper copies given at today's meeting.

- b. Statement of Expectations may be modified by the candidate, dean or department head before the Mid-Tenure Review: but changes after the Mid-Tenure Review can only be initiated by the candidate.
- c. Changes were made to grants of equivalency credit.
- d. Departments/Units may specify standards for scholarship that are consistent with college policy.
- e. Comprehensive Mid-Tenure Review Section is expanded greatly. The department head solicits external letters but letters are then received by the tenure committee, not the department.
- f. The department head provides a letter for tenure from the perspective of the colleague, supervisor and administrator.
- g. The college tenure committee will have to vote to approve, and this requires 2/3 majority by secret vote.

Discussion and Q&A ensued.

- M. Kotlarchyk: In benchmarking other institutions, did you check to see if faculty could see these external letters?
A: Yes, in 3 out of 10 institutions faculty could see external letters. In 4 out of 10 institutions faculty could not see the external letters.
- M. Kotlarchyk: In what sort of units may standards for scholarship be specified?
A: Units smaller than colleges, so it would be in departments.
- T. Engström: Policies approved by faculty in a department must be approved by the Academic Senate, correct? And the extension of the probationary period, due to having a new child, this applies to both men and women?
A: Yes, both men and women.
T. Engström: Can there be a shared extension for two faculty if they become parents?
A: By default, the policy applies to both.
- H. Yamashita: In regards to the department head's vote, is this the department head's vote alone or does it represent the entire department faculty?
A: It is the department head's vote alone, but can of course include information from others.

ADJOURNMENT: 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael Richmond, AS Communications Officer
Vivian Gifford, AS Senior Staff Assistant